MASTER
NEGATIVE
NO. 93-81195-5

MICROFILMED 1993

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES/NEW YORK

as part of the
"Foundations of Western Civilization Preservation Project"

Funded by the
NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

Reproductions may not be made without permission from
Columbia University Library

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

The copyright law of the United States - Title 17, United States Code - concerns the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or other reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copy order if, in its judgement, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of the copyright law.

AUTHOR:

PERKS, ROBERT H.

TITLE:

WHY I CONDEMN VIVISECTION

PLACE:

PAIGNTON

DATE:

[1905?]

Master Negative #

93-81195-5

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DEPARTMENT

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

Original Material as Filmed - Existing Bibliographic Record

179.4
Z4
v.2

Perks, Robert H

Why I condemn vivisection, [by] Robert H. Perks ... Paignton, England, The Order of the golden age [1905?]

cover title, 24 p. 19.cm in 24 cm.

Reprinted from The Herald of the golden age.
Volume of pamphlets

Restrictions on Use:

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35 mm REDUCTION RATIO: 11x
IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA (IIA) IB IIB
DATE FILMED: 3/24/93 INITIALS BAP
FILMED BY: RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS, INC WOODBRIDGE, CT

AIIM

Association for Information and Image Management
1100 Wayne Avenue, Suite 1100
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
301/587-8202

Centimeter

Inches

MANUFACTURED TO AIIM STANDARDS
BY APPLIED IMAGE, INC.

RHR 179.4 No 7

Why I Condemn Vivisection.

ROBERT H. PERKS,
M.D., F.R.C.S., Eng.

PRICE ONE PENNY
7/6 per hundred.

The Order of the Golden Age,
PAIGNTON, ENGLAND.

With the Compliments
of the
Executive Council
of
The Order of the Golden Age.

Paignton.
(England).

Reprinted from "The Herald of the Golden Age."

Why I Condemn Vivisection.

Vivisection, literally the "cutting of the living," is the term used to designate experiments upon animals for the purpose of physiological and pathological research, and includes not only those involving actual cutting, but also those in which the "subjects" are, to use plain language, starved, baked, frozen, drowned, etc., or inoculated with various diseases, to the same end.

This species of torture—detailed accounts of which are freely and fully published in the various journals devoted to such records, not only without shame but with appreciation—is inflicted upon thousands of warm-blooded sentient creatures annually. Only in a very small proportion of these operations, such as those of very brief duration, or in which the animal is killed at its termination, is consciousness abolished by the use of anæsthetics such as chloroform and ether. More frequently the convenience of the *operator* and not the benefit of the *victim* is considered, and the anæsthesia is brief and only partial in character; or the victim is "quieted" by the administration of drugs such as morphia, chloral, curare and others—in no sense true anæsthetics—by which it is rendered more or less muscularly inert, *but with sensibility still intact.* But in a large number of cases, necessarily including those in which exposed vital organs are under "observation" for days, weeks, or even months—and in all cases of inoculation of disease, in which the consequent sufferings are often very severe and prolonged—anæsthetics are of course out of the question.

A very brief acquaintance with the literature of the subject is sufficient to convince anyone—even if he be of the most ordinary intelligence—that a vast aggregate

of severe and protracted animal suffering, often amounting to "torture of the most atrocious description the mind of man can conceive" (to quote the words of the Arch-Vivisector, Claude Bernard,) is caused by this practice, a fact freely admitted by those who uphold it. And this takes place in the laboratories of those nations who pride themselves on being the most "progressive," "highly civilized," and "Christian."

The chief reason given for acquiescence in, and condonation of these barbarities, and one which is usually thoughtlessly accepted as being adequate, is that such methods of research are *necessary* and indeed indispensable in order to gain knowledge for the successful treatment of disease. I say "thoughtlessly," because if the actual practice could be revealed, brought home, as it were, in all its naked hideousness to persons not yet hardened by familiarity, they would recoil in horror from it.

Let us suppose a sick man consenting to an animal being brought to his bedside and subjected to prolonged torture and mutilation in the hope that he might *possibly* gain thereby relief of his disorder; would not his neighbours, as their hearts were torn by the cries of the victim, denounce him with one accord as a heartless wretch unworthy of the name of man? I have sufficient faith in the better feelings of humanity to believe that this would be so.

Yet such is the prevalent apathy and lack of imagination, to use no harsher terms, that in the absence of practical realization people willingly become, in their capacity as electors, the aiders and abettors of numberless deeds of darkness of this nature.

I admit that most people are oblivious of the fact that we have the recorded testimony of many of the most eminent members of the medical profession to the effect that no knowledge of real and lasting value has been gained thereby, but, on the contrary, that such "knowledge" has been eminently unsatisfactory, contradictory, and misleading, and has often seriously hindered the real advance of medical science.

It is not my purpose within the limits of this paper to discuss the questions, as to the exact amount of pain inflicted in certain cases, or the value of the results alleged to have been gained by the practice of vivisection.

The primary consideration which contronts us is this—Is it *right* or is it *wrong?* Is its practice a violation of the moral law, and of the Eternal and Divine laws of Justice and Love? If it is, as I believe it to be, such a violation, then these questions are relatively unimportant, for no pleading of "good intentions," no amount of "good results," no minimising of the amount of pain inflicted, can justify this practice. Such a plea might, with equal want of logic, be advanced to establish the contention that the "good results" accruing from the benevolent distribution of stolen property by a thief can justify his crime.

On this point I quote Herr D. L. Ortt:—

"In our decision on the morality of an action, we may not ask whether it will be useful or prejudicial. We admit in other cases that a human life is not to be esteemed the highest and most important of all things. We esteem it brave and noble that a man should offer up his life for an ideal. We admire the heroes who died for their fatherland, or from loyalty to a cause or person: we extol the martyrs who died for their creed and thereby we proclaim that we esteem ideals higher than a human life. . . . We should hold it cowardice if any one to rescue his life, had renounced loyalty to his prince, his fatherland, or his creed. Is it not then cowardice that out of fear to lose our miserable life we should forsake loyalty to our highest feeling of humanity and allow innocent creatures to suffer in order to prolong somewhat our days on earth, or to improve a little the condition of our health?

"Let each one answer this question for himself.

"For my part, when I first faced the question of whether vivisection was or was not lawful, of whether animals might be sacrificed, when this would indeed bring good to many men or, indeed, to a great number of animals, there flashed into my mind suddenly the thought of how Jesus would have regarded the question. Would He ever have plunged the vivisecting knife into the body of an animal to further science or the prosperity of mankind? And when I considered the question in this light my choice was made. Then I knew vivisection to be an evil, howsoever one may seek to justify it."

I think it is not difficult to show that vivisection, in its nature, is essentially anti-human as well as being opposed to the Divine Will—for its true roots lie deep in cynical egoism and callous selfishness, the prolific soil from which spring the worst crimes.

When vivisection was first introduced into England on an extended scale in the middle of the last century, the medical profession (like the persons in the case we have supposed) recoiled in horror from the attempt to advance knowledge by such means, and their leading organs,

including the *Lancet* and the *British Medical Journal*, condemned the practice in no measured terms. What a confirmation is their changed attitude towards it to-day, of the fact that long and familiar association with evil surely clouds the understanding and debases the moral standard! Truly one cannot touch pitch and escape defilement.

Again, assuming for a moment the truth of the statement that vivisection is absolutely necessary if we would gain the knowledge required for the successful treatment of disease, might we not expect that it would be only undertaken as a dreaded and dreadful *last resource*, when all other means had failed? But the facts show that the very opposite is the case.

The majority of the ills from which we suffer may be arranged as to their causes in three main groups, thus :—

(*a*) Those due to violation or neglect of hygiene, including such as are caused by overcrowding, dangerous trades, food adulteration, etc.

(*b*) Those due to dietetic errors, viz: overfeeding and gluttony, the use of flesh foods, and alcoholism.

(*c*) Those due to what may be termed "nerve exhaustion," the result of the haste to be rich, the "strife," "rush," "worry," and "fear," of our modern civilization, either voluntarily acquired in the pursuit of selfish aims, or caused by the injustice of our social laws, and by the action of our ruthless competitive system.

In the light afforded by such a classification is it not certain that if man were to repent him (in the true sense of the word) of these errors, and earnestly set about amending his ways, nine-tenths of the diseases which afflict him would speedily disappear and be unknown in the course of a generation or two; by which time the consequent enhancement of physical vigour and stamina would most probably have rendered him immune to the remainder.

Why then has this radical and rational method of dealing with disease, or rather its *prevention*, been neglected (except in very limited and special directions)? Because *self* stands in the way; and such reform would necessitate the renunciation of much that man considers desirable. In fact it would involve *self-sacrifice*, and rather than face this alternative he prefers to retain his luxuries, vices and follies, and to attempt, instead, to wring from the involuntary sufferings *of others* the knowledge that he

hopes may save him from the disease and death which are the inevitable results of his physical transgression. Truly a vain and cowardly attempt to escape the retributive effects of his own iniquities!

Thus does vivisection reveal itself as the very antithesis of the Law of Love whose Golden Rule "to do unto others as we would that they should do unto us" has ever taken the chief place in the teachings of all God's inspired messengers to man throughout the Ages—and most notably in those of the Christ. This marks it as of the infernal, as essentially of evil, the negation of good.

It is vain to expect from such a source any saving knowledge or deliverance from disease! Rather will this cruelty, this selfish infliction of unmeasured sufferings upon our sub-human fellow-creatures, yield a terrible harvest of quite another sort.

In fact, are we not already reaping that which we have sown, in the increase of disease and lunacy which is now in evidence, and especially in that fearful and paralysing sense of fear—fear of sickness, of poverty, of death—fear of we know not what impending calamities, that dominates and renders miserable the lives of so many amongst us, and which is a marked mental characteristic of this Age?

It is high time that Christendom awakened from its apathetic slumber, and realized the true meaning of this practice, so that it may be banished from our midst.

And is it not a lamentable fact that, with a few noble exceptions, the attitude of the teachers and members of our Churches towards this evil is one of indifference or selfish acquiescence? When will they realize that by their tacit sanction, and acceptance of the fruits of this atrocious crime—for it is nothing less—they are actual, though vicarious, partakers of its guilt; that they crucify their Lord afresh in the torments they inflict on His creatures; and that by so doing they thrust themselves from His Presence!

Well may they feel that spiritual weakness and poverty is their portion, when Love and Mercy, the first principles of the Gospel of The Christ, whose followers and brethren they profess to be, are supplanted in their midst by a spirit of heartless self-seeking.

I commend to their notice the following from the pen of the late Dr. Anna Kingsford, which gives us in eloquent and thrilling words a presentation of the true nature of vivisection and its identity in kind and method with the works of the black magicians of all ages :—

"Side by side with the true priestly magic, there has always been the unholy art of the wizard, the art of black magic, that of the man who sought to produce miraculous effects by evil means. To know, to heal, to work marvels by true magic, it is necessary to live purely, to abstain from indulgence of the flesh, and to do the deeds of love. All this did not suit the man of the world, who desired to attain the same results, but without the self-sacrifice. He had recourse then to devils, and wrung from them by evil means miraculous powers. To satisfy and to propitiate them, he offered living oblations in secret places, and sacrificed to them the most innocent victims he could procure, putting them to hideous deaths in order to obtain the knowledge or power he sought. The same part is played by the vivisector of to-day. He is, in fact, a practitioner of black magic; he obtains his knowledge by means of the exact counterparts of the bloody devil-sacrifices of the wizards, and, like them, he damns himself in the process. In what shall we say the practices of the secret devil-worshippers of mediæval times differed from those which now go on in the underground laboratories of the Medical School at Paris? (and elsewhere). There, as from time to time a door swings open below that flight of stone steps leading down into the darkness, you may hear a burst of shrieks and moans such as those which arose from the subterraneous vaults of the sorcerers of the dark ages. It is—as it was then—the wizard at his work, the votary of Satan pursuing his researches, and at the price of torture and of his soul, wrestling knowledge from the powers of evil.

"It used to be deemed a damnable sin to practice such black arts as these. But now their professors hold their Sabbat in public, and their enunciations are reported in the journals of the day. It is held to be superstition to believe that in former ages wizards were able by secret tortures and unheard-of atrocities to wrest knowledge from Nature; but now the self-same crimes are openly and universally practised; and men everywhere trust their efficacy.

"What is needed is the revival of the true magic of the Pure Life, which heals without blood and gives health without vicarious disease. It is black magic, which, in order to cure a patient, first transfers his complaint to an innocent victim. He who accepts health at such a cost shall but save it to lose it."

In relation to this aspect of the question, we would say, with Fenelon, that "*Knowledge* is not the only needful matter, what is essential is *Love*."

☙ ☙ ☙

It is an universal experience that familiarity with cruel and bloody scenes, or participation in cruel acts, invariably leads to a deterioration of the moral sense, and exercises a

distinctly brutalizing effect on spectators and actors alike; and as evidence that vivisection produces such effects—as might be predicated from its nature—it will be sufficient to quote from the writings of some of the most "celebrated" experimenters. Thus says M. de Cyon in a work which he prepared for the guidance of students—"The true vivisector must approach a difficult vivisection with the same *joyful ardour and the same delight* wherewith a surgeon undertakes a difficult operation."—*Methodik*, p. 15. (Note that a surgeon is understood to approach a terrible operation with delight!) Claude Bernard wrote thus—"He (the vivisector) is no ordinary man. He is a learned man, a man possessed and absorbed by a scientific idea. He does not hear the animal's cries of pain. He is blind to the blood that flows. *He sees nothing but his idea.*"—*Introduction à l'Etude de la Medicine Experimentale*, p. 180. An awful picture, to quote a recent writer, of a man besotted with a lust of knowledge, just as murderers are sometimes besotted with a lust of gold: the one as pitiless and as regardless of all law as the other.

Again, note the answers given by Dr. Emanuel Klein, one of the most active of vivisectors in England, and who is still working here, to questions put by members of the Royal Commission, 1875. (I give only a few extracts) :—

Asked by the Chairman of the Commission (3539): "When you say that you only use them (*i.e.*, anæsthetics) for convenience sake, do you mean that you have no regard at all to the sufferings of the animals?"—"*No regard at all.*"

Asked again (3541): "Then for your own purposes you disregard entirely the question of the suffering of the animal in performing a painful experiment?"—"*I do.*"

Asked (3546): "Do you believe that that is a general practice on the Continent to disregard altogether the feelings of the animals?"—"*I believe so.*"

Asked (3553): "But you believe that, generally speaking, there is a very different feeling in England?"—"*Not among the physiologists; I do not think there is.*"

Asked (3739); "And you think that the view of scientific men on the Continent is your view, that animal suffering is so entirely unimportant compared with scientific research that it should not be taken into account at all?"—"*Yes, except for convenience sake.*"

These replies indicate a deplorable callousness to suffering in the speaker himself, and he admits that in his opinion many English vivisectors feel and act as he does in this matter.

Such damnatory testimonies might be largely multiplied, but these will suffice to illustrate my point, and fully justify

the late Mr. Henry Lee, F.R.C.S. (Senior Consulting Surgeon to St. George's Hospital, London, and Lecturer on Pathology and Surgery to the Royal College of Surgeons, England) in his opinion that—

"The hands of the vivisector, *by the repeated use of morally unlawful things, gradually become hardened, and a kind of creeping paralysis finally extends to the vital parts.* We have it on evidence before the Royal Commission that, while interested in his experiments, he thinks nothing of the animals' sufferings, but, which is of far more importance, common experience shows that as a rule he is quite indifferent to the mental and sometimes bodily sufferings which the record of his experiments produces upon a large section of the public."

In the light afforded by these extracts, it is manifest that the growing practice in our Medical Schools of demonstrating the elementary facts of physiology by experiments on living animals, before classes of young and impressionable male and female (!) students, cannot be otherwise than productive of grave moral evils, and this amongst precisely that section of the rising generation (the medical) whose ethical and altruistic ideals should be of the highest, if they would prove themselves worthy of their profession and of the confidence reposed in them by their fellows. The opinions of many well-known physicians testify to the reality of this danger. I give a few only :—

"I would shrink with horror from accustoming large classes of young men to the sight of animals under vivisection. I believe many of them would become cruel and hardened, and would go away and repeat those experiments recklessly. Science would gain nothing, and *the world would have let loose upon it a set of young devils.*"

DR. S. HOUGHTON, *of Dublin, in evidence before the Royal Commission.*

"Watch the students at a vivisection. It is the blood and suffering, not the science, that rivets their breathless attention."

PROF. BIGELOW, *late Professor of Surgery in Harvard University, in paper read before the Massachusetts Medical Society.*

"In the hands of the teacher it may be rankly abused; of scientific pursuits it is *the one most liable to error;* it suggests no end to itself, but seems to grow by what it feeds on, becoming by repetition and contest more and more extended and multiplied; . . . and for all such reasons . . . *is calculated to lead to what would be designated intellectual and moral evil.*"

SIR B. W. RICHARDSON, *Biological Experimentation*, p. 138.

And as long as seventy years ago the celebrated Dr. Abernethy, the contemporary of Majendie, said: "Vivisection has the *direct effect of deteriorating the moral sense:* and once the moral sense is destroyed, it is impossible to foresee the consequences."

Further, the attempt to gain knowledge respecting the processes of human physiology and pathology by the vivisection of the lower animals is radically *unscientific.* In respect to the former, because the abnormal conditions (pain, shock or anæsthesia) under which the experiment is conducted necessarily vitiate any conclusions which may be drawn from it, as Sir B. W. Richardson observes in the work just quoted above—"It is utterly impossible to observe natural function *under the shadow of pain* either in man or animal;" and as regards the latter branch of investigation, it is well-known that the reaction of the lower animals to injury, induced disease, and drugs, differs greatly both in kind and degree from that of man to the same agents, so much so that it is notorious that in all such investigations the results have been confusing and contradictory (and therefore worthless) in the highest degree; in plain words have served to darken knowledge rather than to reveal it.

Claude Bernard, master-vivisector as he was, voiced his opinion on this point in one of his lectures, by advising his students, whilst pursuing the study of human disease, "to forget all that they had ever learned from vivisection." And many vivisectors, both in the past and to-day, have used this very fact, *i.e.*, the impossibility of obtaining reliable knowledge of human diseases, etc., through experiments on the lower animals, as the ground of their advocacy of, or apologies for, human vivisection, many cases of which have come to light in recent years; some indeed have been published by their authors with a degree of shamelessness and cynicism rarely surpassed (for particulars see appendices to the reprint of these articles, now being published.)

And it was precisely this reason which was urged by the supporters of a Bill for the Utilization of Criminals by Vivisection, introduced into the State Legislature of Ohio, in recent years (and which was only rejected by a small majority.)

That section of the public who have hitherto treated this subject with selfish apathy would do well to lay to heart the truth *that human vivisection is the logical and inevitable outcome of animal vivisection;* it may, when higher considerations fail, by its suggestion of danger to their own precious persons, serve to arouse such from their attitude of acquiescence in this crime.

Lastly, the study of evolution has taught us the "solidarity" of the organic creation, and that as regards animals there is no abrupt line of demarcation between the physical structure and physiological functions of its various families—that in these they differ not in *kind* but in *degree* only of development and specialization, and that man is but the "elder brother" of them all. The stages in his embryonic development, and the presence in his body of the vestiges of many structures now no longer useful to him, but which are found fully developed in many of the lower animals, demonstrate clearly the path by which he has travelled.

To admit (as I think a careful study of biology compels us to do) that the so-called lower animals are in this sense akin to ourselves—a part of one scheme—and differing only in degree of development, is to admit that we have responsibilities and duties towards them as lesser children of the same Supreme Father, which cannot lightly be neglected, evaded or set at naught, and which unmistakably indicate that the true relation of man towards them should be that of guardian and friend—as far as their natures will permit—and as teacher, striving to develop their intelligence to its utmost capacity. By so doing he fulfils the Divine law of Love to the neighbour, whilst enobling his own nature; and reaps a rich reward in the affection and fidelity of his "little brothers."

In the study of evolution we find so many evidences of the "unity" of all living things, and of the presence of a directing and beneficent Intelligence in the laws which govern its action, that the bare idea of vivisection becomes unspeakably revolting and impossible to every mind that truly apprehends them.

To sum up, I condemn vivisection because—

It is unscientific, and its results, therefore, are misleading, contradictory and useless. It also tends to cause neglect of the true scientific methods of clinical and pathological research.

It is productive of a vast amount of severe suffering to animals without any corresponding advantage to them.

Its effect on those who practice or who witness it, is inevitably to debase the moral and spiritual standard and to develop selfish, cruel and callous tendencies, which are a grave menace to Society.

It is a direct infraction of the moral law—a doing of evil in the false hope that good may result.

It is the antithesis of the Divine law of Love—in the observance of which lies the sole method of man's growth and upliftment—socially, morally and spiritually.

As a nation we have legalized this practice, though it is also true that in so doing we have to some small extent mitigated its horrors.

As citizens we are each responsible in a degree for our share in recognizing and fostering this crime against our sub-human kindred, ourselves and our God.

The same power (our own) which has so legalized, can also abolish it from our midst; and it remains for each and all of us to exercise it.

I have written this paper in the hope that many of my readers may be led thereby to see this practice in its true light, and so be impelled to use their influence in promoting *right* knowledge, *right* feeling and *right* action concerning it, so that its abolition may not be long delayed, and that its dire and inevitable consequences may be averted from us and from our descendants.

For be assured that in respect to this meanest crime of our civilization, "God is not mocked, for *whatsoever* a man soweth *that* shall he also reap."

Robert H. Perks.

"A Sacred kinship we may not forego,

Binds us to all that breathes!"

---

over

Appendix I.

SOME MEDICAL TESTIMONIES AGAINST VIVISECTION.

LAWSON TAIT, F.R.C.S., M.D., LL.D., *Ex-Professor of Gynæcology, Mason's College, Birmingham.*

"Some day I shall have a tombstone put over me and an inscription upon it. I want only one thing recorded on it, and that to the effect that 'he laboured to divert his profession from the blundering which has resulted from the performance of experiments on the sub-human groups of animal life, in the hope that they would shed light on the aberrant physiology of the human groups.' Such experiments never have succeeded, and never can; and they have, as in the cases of Koch, Pasteur and Lister, not only hindered true progress, but have covered our profession with ridicule."—From a letter in the *Medical Press and Circular*, May, 1899.

"Syme and Fergusson were the greatest surgeons I have ever known, and they were right in stoutly asserting that Surgery has in no wise been advanced by vivisection."

SIR WILLIAM FERGUSSON, F.R.S. (*formerly Sergeant-Surgeon to the Queen*).

"I am not aware of any of these experiments on the lower animals having led to the mitigation of pain or to improvement as regards surgical details." (Evidence before Royal Commission, 1876).

SURGEON-GENERAL SIR CHARLES ALEXANDER GORDON, K.C.B. (*formerly Honorary Physician to the Queen.*)

"I hold that the practice of performing experiments upon the lower animals with a view to benefiting humanity, is fallacious."—(Speech at Westminster Palace Hotel, London, June 22nd, 1892).

SIR CHAS. BELL (*Physiologist and Anatomist, formerly Professor of Surgery, University of Edinburgh*).

"Experiments have never been the means of discovery, and a survey of what has been attempted of late years in physiology will prove that the opening of living animals has done more to perpetuate error than to confirm the just views taken from the study of anatomy and natural motions."—(*Nervous System of the Human Body*, p. 217).

HENRY J. BIGELOW, M.D. (*Member of the Massachusetts Medical Society, Emeritus Professor of Surgery in Harvard University, etc.*

"There is little in the literature of what is called the horrors of vivisection which is not well grounded on truth. . . . A torture of helpless animals—more terrible, by reason of its refinement and the effort to prolong it, than burning at the stake, which is brief—is now being carried on in all civilized nations, not in the name of religion but of science. . . . By far the larger part of vivisection is as useless as was an *auto-da-fe*. . . . The law should interfere. There can be no doubt that in this relation there exists a case of cruelty to animals far transcending in its refinement and in its horrors anything that has been known in the history of nations. There will come a time when the world will look back to modern vivisection in the name of science as they now do to burning at the stake in the name of religion."—Extracts from *Anæsthesia, Addresses and other Papers*, 1900, p. 363.

FORBES WINSLOW, D C L., OXON, M.R.C.P., LONDON (*Physician to the British Hospital for Mental Diseases; Physician to North London Hospital for Consumption, etc.*)

"In my opinion Vivisection has opened up no new views for the treatment and cure of diseases. It is most unjustifiable and cruel, and in no way advances medical science."—(American Humane Association's *Report on Vivisection*, p. 13).

CHAS. BELL-TAYLOR, M.D., F.R.C.S.

"If anything could exceed the hideous cruelty of the whole business, it would be the childish absurdity of the claims to benefit which are being constantly put forth by the advocates and promoters of the system."—(Address before Medico-Chirurgical Society of Nottingham, November 16, 1892).

JAMES E. GARRETSON, M.D. (*Senior Professor of Surgery, Medico-Chirurgical College, Philadelphia*).

"I am without words to express my horror of vivisection, though I have been a teacher of anatomy and surgery for thirty years. It serves no purpose that is not better served after other manners."—(Letter to American Humane Association's *Report on Vivisection*, 1895, p. 13).

WILLIAM J. MORTON, M.D. (*Professor of Nervous and Mental Diseases at the N. York Post Graduate Med. School and Hospital*).

"If mankind suffers from disease it is its own fault, to be cured by the rectification of the causes which lead to it; and it is subversive of the high and moral order of the progress of humanity to inflict pain or death upon other living animals to abolish or minimize disease or suffering due to mankind's own faults. In the end, the retribution to the race which does this will equal and offset the advantages temporarily gained. One crime or fault does not excuse or justify another."—(Letter to American Humane Association's *Report on Vivisection*, 1895, p. 13).

GEORGE WILSON, M.D., LL.D., EDIN., F.R.S., D.P.H., CAMBRIDGE.

"There are not a few who doubt whether all the agonies inflicted on animals sacrificed in the laboratories of Continental workers in bacteriological research, or even those at home. . . . *have saved one single human life, or lessened in any appreciable degree the load of human suffering.*"—Page 443 of the 8th Edition, 1898, of the *Handbook of Hygiene and Sanitary Science.*

"I accuse my profession of misleading the public as to the cruelties and horrors which are perpetrated on animal life. When it is stated that the actual pain involved in these experiments is commonly of the most trifling description, there is a *suppressio veri* of the most palpable kind, which could only be accounted for at the time by ignorance of the actual facts."—(From a paper read before the Section of State Medicine, British Medical Association Annual Meeting, Portsmouth, August, 1899).

FRANCOIS ACHILLE LONGET, VIVISECTOR (*Late Professor of Physiology at the Medical Faculty of Paris.*)

"Experiments on animals of a different species, so far from leading to useful results as regarded human beings, had a tendency to mislead us. In seeking to benefit mankind by vivisection, it would be necessary to have recourse to pathological facts founded on experiments on human beings."—(Quoted in Prize Essay on Vivisection, p. 23, by George Fleming, F.R.G.S., F.H.S.L., of London, published in Philadelphia, 1874).

CHARLES CLAY, M.D. (THE LATE).

"As a surgeon, I have performed a very large number of operations, but I do not owe a particle of my knowledge or skill to vivisection. I challenge any member of my profession to prove that vivisection has in any way advanced the science of medicine, or tended to improve the treatment of disease."—(Letter in London *Times*, July 31st, 1880).

GORDON STABLES, M.D., C.M.

" . . . I have never yet met a truly brave man who was not kind to God's lower creatures, nor do I believe that a man can be both cruel and brave; but the amount of cruelty that takes place in this country under the title of legalized experimentalism is horrible to contemplate. It is ten times worse on the Continent, especially in such institutes as those in Paris."—(Letter in London *Daily Telegraph*, August 31, 1892).

JOHN H. CLARKE, M.D., LONDON.

"Our country, I trust . . . will purge itself from this, the meanest of all its crimes."—(In a paper read before the Church Congress, at Folkestone, October 6, 1892.)

STEPHEN TOWNSEND, F.R.C.S.

"I contend that these experiments, from a moral point of view, are criminal, inasmuch as they often involve the unnecessary torture of sensitive animals, and that from a scientific and didactic point of view, they are worse than useless." —(Article in *The Animals' Friend*, April, 1896).

F. S. ARNOLD, M.A., M.B. (OXON).

"I believe that vivisection is a barren and misleading method of research from whose practice no benefit has accrued to humanity which would for a moment be considered by any unbiassed person, cognizant of all the facts, to out-weigh the animal suffering and human degradation it has caused and still causes."—(From article in *The Animals' Friend*, January, 1895).

"I believe that medicine and surgery have gained nothing by vivisection, that it is, considered as a method of research, utterly barren and misleading, and bound in the nature of things always to be so. I am, however, not putting forward an opinion but stating a fact when I say that there is not one of the "triumphs of vivisection," such as the antitoxin treatment of diphtheria, Pasteurian inoculation for anthrax, hydrophobia, etc., whose utility is not strenuously denied by eminent physicians and surgeons who are themselves supporters of vivisection. Vivisection, that is to say, has produced absolutely nothing whose utility to "suffering humanity" is unanimously affirmed, even by the vivisecting fraternity itself.—(Letter to *Abolitionist*, September 15th, 1903.)

JOHN ELLIOTSON, M.D., F.R.S. (*Physiologist*).

"A course of experimental physiology, in which brutes are agonized to exhibit facts already established is a disgrace to the country that permits it." —(Elliotson's *Human Physiology*, p. 428).

EDWARD BERDOE, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.

"I have seen the rise and fall of the Pasteurian quackery, the fiasco of Koch's tuberculin and the diphtheria antitoxin nostrum, and every day confirms my belief that vivisection founded on cruelty, supported by falsehood, and practiced for selfish ends is not the method by which the merciful art of healing can be improved; nor can it be shown that any disease can be cured by any method derived from it."

S. MILLS FOWLER, M.D. (*Professor of the Practice of Medicine in Dunham Medical College, Chicago*).

"I am utterly opposed to the practice of vivisection. The brutality manifest in its employment is a disgrace to our civilization. It disgraces not only those who employ it, but also those who witness it. It should receive the unqualified condemnation of every civilized person."

ARTHUR GUINNESS, M.D., F.R.C.S.

"When I reflect on the abominable cruelties inflicted on them (animals) by such callous beings as M. de Cyon and many others, I regret to say, of my own countrymen, I can truly say a thrill of horror comes over me, and also disgust when I think that mankind can be so degraded as to commit such horrors."—(From letter in *Oxford Times*, Oct., 1902.)

DEP. SURGEON-GENERAL THORNTON, C.B.

"There is no doubt that vivisection is an immoral practice, and can only be defended on the principle that the end justifies the means—a principle which has been used in past times for the defence and justification of all kinds of cruelty . . . *This principle undermines morality itself*, and opens the door to crimes of every description, all of which can be defended if we once admit that it is right to do evil that good may come."—(From the *Principal Claims on behalf of Vivisection*, 1901, p. 10.)

AUGUSTUS BROWN, M.D.

"I can only say I am entirely opposed to the practice (vivisection) which I regard as both very cruel and unnecessary."—(From "Replies to circular letter of Friends A.V. Assoc.," 1900, p. 10.)

JOHN MCLACHLAN, M.D., F.R.C.S.

"Vivisection is absolutely incompatible with the teachings of Jesus Christ, and with the profession of a Christian."—(From the same, p. 11.)

JOSIAH OLDFIELD, D.C.L., M.A., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.

"I am opposed to vivisection on the grounds that the deliberate infliction of considerable pain upon an unwilling victim for a speculative gain is contrary to the Divine Ideal of the Cosmos, and is, therefore, in the highest sense of the word unscientific."—(From the same, p. 19.)

H. H. S. DORMAN, M.D.

"I can assure you I abhor the thought of such practices. Besides, I believe they are of no practical utility."—(From the same, p. 21.)

J. MAY, M.R.C.S., etc.

"I think it immoral to purchase man's physical well-being or advantage at the expense of the sufferings of animals; especially when such physical good is gained at the cost of spiritual deterioration (to the operators)."—(From the same, p. 22.)

FRANCES HOGGAN, M.D.

"I have long held that animals should be protected from all kinds of abuse and most of all from scientific cruelty. I have had painful experience of the callousness engendered by the habit of mind which sees in the living animal only material for research."—(From the same, p. 25.)

E. H. HAWKER, M.D.

"I believe that vivisection blunts the moral sense to such a degree as to become a strong force in the production of criminals."—(From the same, p. 14).

ALLAN MOTT-KING, M.D.

"Vivisection is an unmanly crime."—(From the same, p. 14).

MATTHEW WOODS, M.D. (*Philadelphia, U.S.A.*)

"The medical profession is not made up of vivisectors; but, on the contrary, men who could no more do a vivisection than they could commit arson, murder, or any other inhuman violation of moral law."—(From a letter to the *Daily News*, 31st Aug. 1903.)

R. E. DUDGEON, M.D.

"In my long experience as a medical practitioner and a not unobservant student of physiology and pathology, I am not aware of the slightest benefit to the sick and suffering that has resulted from the vivisection of animals."—(From letter to *The Times*, March, 1902).

W. R. HADWEN, M.D., L.R.C.P.

"As to the subject of vivisection generally, I view it as a useless and unscientific practice, and, in the words of the good Lord Shaftesbury, "an abominable sin." It is an inhuman practice, a relic of the barbaric past, which ought to be prohibited by law."—(From a letter to the *Daily News*, August 28th, 1903).

DR. PAQUET, PARIS (*formerly Medical-Inspector of the Enfants Assistes de la Seine*).

"Vivisection is useless in the study of medical science; in the study of anatomy, for which the dissection of the human corpse suffices, and in the study of surgery, the practical operations on a corpse on the one hand, and the daily accidents in which urgent surgical aid is required, on the other, being all that is necessary for the student.

"It is also useless in the study of physiology, for, if we are to-day cognisant of the functions of the organs, it is through having treated them when injured. It is in the 'clinique,' and not in the vivisecting room, that we have learned the physiological rôle which each organ in the human body plays.

over

"In order to study the action of medicinal matters, would it for a moment enter into the head of a serious practitioner to imagine that what passes in the body of a healthy animal would be the same as in that of a sick person? Never!

"Therefore, if vivisection is useless, the practice of it is criminal, since it provokes suffering by which no one is benefited."—(From *New York Herald*, Paris Ed., March 20th, 1904).

PROF. LEON MARCHAND, M.D., PARIS.

"It is an error to suppose that vivisection has given any true scientific notions to either surgery or medicine. It is quite the contrary. I have always found what are called 'scientific experiments' not only strange and inhuman, but illusory and dangerous, and I am astonished that all my brother doctors do not recognise the inanity of the 'investigations' as practiced by the vivisectionists."—(From the same).

DR. EDGARD HIRTZ, PARIS (*Physician to the Necker Hospital*).

"I am decidedly hostile to vivisection, of which the vivisectors make an intolerable abuse; for they cause wretched dogs, rabbits, and guinea-pigs to suffer in order to obtain not only problematical results, but those which are in no way interesting. Perhaps in historical times certain experiments may have been justified, when made by great physiologists with moderation and humanity. Now it is the contrary; vivisection is practised even by students. It is a useless torture, and a sterile cruelty!"—(From the same).

DR. NICOD, PARIS.

"From a scientific point of view I consider that vivisection cannot do otherwise than divert right judgment into error, the vivisectionists operating upon the healthy organs of animals, whereas the operations practised upon man are only done upon organs afflicted with divers maladies. As to the moral point: no beneficial result for humanity can be obtained by practices so barbarous and cruel. The only good result which could be obtained would be to vivisect human beings, and my advice to vivisectors is that they should commence by operating upon each other!"—(From the same).

DR. C. MATHIEU, PARIS.

"While studying medicine in the hospitals I was at one time charged with the functions of preparing the physiological experiments. It was for a short time only, as I could not support the sense of horror which these vivisections caused me. I consider them to be useless cruelties. I never learnt anything from them, and I consider the campaign against vivisection noble and humane."—(From the same).

DR. SALIVAS, PARIS.

"I consider," he states, "that vivisection is immoral in the highest degree. It is as useless as it is immoral, and I condemn it absolutely. The immortal Hippocrates never vivisected, yet he raised his art to a height that we are far from attaining to-day, in spite of our pretended great modern discoveries, discoveries which have, for the most part, the result of introducing into medical science extravagant theories which it will be most difficult to eradicate."—(From the same).

DR. HERVOUET, PARIS.

"I do not recognise the right to destroy a living organism except in self-defence. My reason for this is nearly a religious one. I condemn absolutely vivisection, and not only vivisection, but hunting, pigeon-shooting, and all killing which has only pleasure for its end."—(From the same).

DR. LEVOISIN, PARIS.

"It is most urgent that vivisection should disappear from the programmes for the teaching of students."—(From the same).

DR GOYARD.

"Science changes its systems often. Why build up ephemeral systems upon the most revolting cruelty? Respect the sufferings of animals."—(From the same)

The *New York Herald* (Paris) has received the assurance that Drs. Michelon, Jules, Grand, J. Monstagne, Jules Delbet, Theophile Pascal, Deyber, Chateau, Charon, Corneille, Duriez, and Lheureux are absolutely opposed to vivisection, and are in favour of its entire abolition."—(*Zoophilist*).

Appendix II.

SOME LAY TESTIMONIES AGAINST VIVISECTION.

THE LATE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE COLERIDGE.

"What would our Lord have said, what looks would He have bent upon a chamber filled with the 'unoffending creatures which He loves,' dying under torture deliberately and intentionally inflicted. . . . . A wrong to the creature is, moreover, an insult to its Creator, and a double insult when we bow to that Creator as a 'God of Love,' whose 'tender mercies are over ALL His works.' To perpetrate cruelty that good may come is therefore blasphemy,—there is no such thing as necessary cruelty more than necessary sin.—(*Fortnightly Review*, February, 1882).

BISHOP BARRY, D.D., D.C.L., *Canon of Windsor, Late Primate of Australia.*

"For humanity at large to seek its own supposed good at all hazard of wrong-doing and cruelty to the weaker creatures of God, is surely of the very essence of selfishness. To hold that the increase of physical comfort, the removal of physical pain, the prolongation of physical life, are the supreme objects, for the sake of which we may demoralise our higher humanity, is simply a worship of the flesh, unworthy of a true man, impossible to a true Christian. To sin for these purposes against God's creatures, bound up with ourselves in the great chain of organic being, and committed to us as made in His image and having a delegatior of His sovereignty, is a prostitution of God-given power which is almost a sacrilege."—(Church Congress, Folkestone, 1892.)

THE BISHOP OF DURHAM (DR. WESTCOTT.)

"If He who made us made all other creatures also, and if they find a place in His Providential plan, if His tender mercies reach to them, and this we Christians most certainly believe—then I find it absolutely inconceivable that He should have so arranged the avenues of knowledge that we can attain to truths, that it is His will which we should master, only through the unutterable agonies of beings which trust in us."—(Sermon in Westminster Abbey, August 13th, 1899.)

THE LATE COLONEL INGERSOLL.

"Vivisection is the inquisition—the hell—of science. All the cruelty which the human—or rather the inhuman—heart is capable of inflicting is in this one word. Below this there is no depth. . . . It is not necessary for a man to be a specialist in order to have and express his opinion as to the right or wrong of vivisection. It is not necessary to be a scientist or a naturalist to detest cruelty and to love mercy. Above all the discoveries of thinkers, above all the inventions of the ingenious, above all the victories of fields of intellectual conflict, rise human sympathy and a sense of justice."—(From the *Chronicle of St. George*, U.S.A., May, 1891).

MRS. BESANT.

"We still find people in the astounding condition of incapacity to see the wickedness of vivisection even after they have learned from the writings of vivisectors that it is not a question of giving a few drugs to animals rather than to men, when the quality of the drugs is unknown, but a question of submitting animals to prolonged torture in the hope of adding a fragment of new knowledge to the store already accumulated. . . . It may be that public opinion will not take alarm until some members of the ruling races are seized by the blood-stained hands of the grim tormentors, and are done to death in quest of some obscure disease. The approval of vivisection is so distinctly a selfish passion, a clutching at a possible chance of gain for man at any cost to others, that it seems but too probable that what the public calls its conscience will not be aroused until its own members are within measureable distance of the torture trough. . . . The black sorcery of savage magic has no horrors so terrible as those of the vivisectors."—(From the *Theosophical Review*, December, 1897).

over

VICTOR HUGO.

"Vivisection is a crime. The human race will repudiate these barbarities."—Reply to Pres. French A. V. Society.

GEORGE MACDONALD, LL.D

"May my God give me grace to prefer a hundred deaths to a life gained by the sufferings of one simplest creature. He holds his life as *I* hold mine, by finding himself where I find myself. Shall I quiet my heart with the throbs of another heart? soothe my nerves with the agonised tension of a system? live a few days longer by a century of shrieking deaths? It were a hellish wrong—a selfish, hateful, violent injustice. It is true we are above the creatures, but not to keep them down; they are for our use and service, but neither to be trodden under foot of pride, or misused as ministers, at their worst cost of suffering, to our inordinate desires of ease."—(From "Paul Faber, Surgeon.")

CARDINAL MANNING.

"I take the first opportunity that has been offered to me to renew publicly my firm determination, so long as life is granted me, to assist in putting an end to that which I believe to be a detestable practice without scientific result, and immoral in itself. . . . I believe the time has come, and I only wish we had the power legally, to prohibit altogether the practice of vivisection. . . . . Nothing can justify, no claim of science, no conjectural result, no hope for discovery, such horrors as these. Also it must be remembered that whereas these torments, refined and indescribable, are certain, the result is altogether conjectural—everything about the result is uncertain but *the certain infraction of the first laws of mercy and humanity.*"—Speech, June 21st, 1882.

CARDINAL NEWMAN.

"Does it not sometimes make us shudder to hear tell of them *(cruel experiments on animals).* . . . It is the cold-blooded and calculating act of men of science, who make experiments on brute animals, perhaps merely from a sort of curiosity. . . . Now what is it moves our very heart, and sickens us so much at cruelty shown to poor brutes? I suppose this first, that they have done us no harm; next, that they have no power whatever of resistance; it is *the cowardice and tyranny* of which they are the victims which makes their sufferings so especially touching; . . . there is something so very dreadful, *so Satanic in tormenting those who never have harmed us,* and who cannot defend themselves, who are utterly in our power," etc.—("Parochial and Plain Sermons," Rivingtons, 1878).

JOHN RUSKIN.

"These scientific pursuits were now defiantly, provokingly, insultingly separated from the science of religion; they were all carried on in defiance of what had hitherto been held to be compassion and pity, and of the great link which bound together the whole Creation from its Maker to the lowest creature."—(Speech at Oxford, December 9th, 1884).

(Ruskin resigned his chair as Slade Professor of Fine Art, in the University of Oxford, as a protest against the inclusion of vivisection among its methods of teaching).

CANON WILBERFORCE.

". . . We say that what is called vivisection is morally indefensible; we believe it is also absolutely scientifically unsound, and we are also more and more convinced that it is one of the very greatest possible evils to the human race."—(From speech in St. James' Hall, May 9th, 1899).

EDWARD MAITLAND, B.A.

"The practice of vivisection involves the reversal of every principle by following which man develops these higher planes of consciousness which raise him above the animals. It means the abandonment of all our moral gains, and a return to the rudiments of existence. If vivisection be right then has the world existed and mankind striven and suffered in vain. If the sacrifice of others to self is to be the rule for ever, let us at once declare might to be right, and vivisect our women and children—any who are unable to protect themselves."—(From letter to *Examiner,* July 17th, 1876.)

Appendix III.

The following Extracts show the attitude of the Medical Press in reference to Vivisection at the time of its general introduction into England, about the middle of the last century, and will serve to indicate the degree to which, in these days, their ethical standard has been lowered by the influence of those who practice it.

"MEDICAL TIMES AND GAZETTE."

September, 1858.

". . . We are inclined to believe that the question will some day be asked, *whether any excuse can make them* (vivisectional experiments) *justifiable?*"

October, 1860.

"We are sure that the profession at large will fully agree with us in condemning experiments which are made simply to demonstrate physiological or other facts which have been received as settled points and are beyond all controversy."

March 2nd, 1861 (Editorial).

"We think that the repetition of experiments before students . . . to be condemned."

August, 1862.

"When the result of an experiment has been fully obtained and confirmed, *its repetition is indefensible.*"

"LANCET."

Aug. 11th, 1860; Oct. 20th, 1860; Aug. 22nd, 1863.

The Editor condemns the repetition of vivisectional experiments in language similar to above.

August 29th, 1863 (Editorial) speaking of the "rather reckless expenditure of the lives and feelings of cold blooded creatures," has the following:—

"The reckless way in which we have seen this poor creature (the frog) cut, thrown, and kicked about, has been sometimes sickening. . . . We cannot help feeling there is both a *bad moral discipline for the man as well as* . . ."

"BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL."

May 11th, 1861 (Editorial).

"*It has never appeared clear to us that we are justified in destroying animals for mere experimental research under any circumstances;* but now that we possess the means of removing sensation during experiments, the man who puts an animal to torture, ought, in our opinion, to be prosecuted."

May 2, 1863; quoted from editoral in "L'Union Médicale," of Paris.

". . . I would gladly petition the Senate to forbid its performance on every animal which is useful to and a friend of man."

August 22nd, 1863 (Editorial).

"We are very glad to find that the French medical journals are entering protests against the cruel abuse which is made of Vivisection in France. *L'Abeille Médicale* says:—

". . . Let no one tell us that vivisections are necessary for a knowledge of physiology. . . . If the present ways, habits and customs are continued, the future physician will become marked by his cold and implacable insensibility. Let there be no mistake about it; *the man who habituates himself to the shedding of blood, and who is insensible to the sufferings of animals is led on into the path of baseness.*"

October 10th, 1863 (Editorial) referring to a speech by M. Dubois at the Academy of Medicine, Paris:—

"M. Dubois showed to demonstration that . . . physiological demonstrations on living animals in the public [Medical] schools *are utterly unjustifiable and a scandal to humanity. In all this, we most thoroughly agree with him.*"

over

June 11th, 1864 (Editorial).

"Far be it from us to patronize or palliate the infamous practices, the unjustifiable practices committed in French veterinary schools, and in many French Medical schools, in the matter of vivisection. We repudiate as brutal and cruel all surgical operations performed on living animals. *We repudiate the repetition of all experiments on animals for the demonstration of any already well-determined physiological question.*"

(I have to acknowledge my indebtedness to Dr. Leffingwell's pamphlet "The Rise of the Vivisection Controversy" for these references).

Italics not in original editorials.

Appendix IV.

HUMAN VIVISECTION.

So far from vivisection saving human beings from being experimented upon, it actually necessitates it."—(JOHN M. CLARKE, M.D., London).

I give below a few instances (a full list would require many pages) in which medical men having their sense of honour and compassion blunted by familiarity with vivisectional practice on the lower animals, and desirous of professional distinction or so-called therapeutic scientific knowledge (which in the very nature of things cannot be gained by experimentation on sub-human creatures), no matter at what cost to others, have violated alike the canons of common humanity, morals, and professional ethics, as well as the trust reposed in them, by subjecting healthy, sick, and even dying persons and little children to what may be truly termed human vivisection, and that without the knowledge or consent of the victims, and with no view to their ultimate benefit.

I am happy in the belief that the great majority of my professional brethren properly regard these procedures as inhuman, immoral, and wholly indefensible; and records show that many of them have lost no opportunity to denounce in the strongest terms the perpetration of such atrocities.

Dr. HAHN, of Friedrickshain, admitted (in *Deutsche Med. Wochenschsrift*, 10th Nov., 1887, p. 987) that he had transplanted nodules from a cancerous growth in a female patient to other parts of the body.

This proceeding was first brought to the notice of the public and denounced strongly by Prof. Cornil and Dr. E. Leidig, it created an immense sensation at the time.

Dr. DOYEN (in a paper read before the Academy of Medicine, in Paris, 23rd June, 1891) describes similar procedures by himself on a female patient.

"Dr. LUND, of Samso, purposely fed his infant son for 16 months on milk from tuberculous cows, with the object of ascertaining whether the disease could be communicated by this means to a human being. The child became the subject of a tuberculous affection in consequence." The *Practitioner* for Nov. 1901 (from Dr. Lund's own report in the *Scandinavian Med. Archives*, 1879, Vol. 11).

Bargigli inoculated two children with matter from a leprous tumour.—Reported by Hirsch in *Handbuch der Historisch Geographischen Pathologie*, 2nd Abtheilung, 1883, p. 32.

Mary Rafferty, a servant girl, was admitted into the Good Samaritan Hospital, Cincinnatti, with fracture of the skull exposing the brain. As her recovery seemed hopeless her surgeon considered himself justified in experimenting on the brain by stimulation by means of the electric current passed through needles inserted into its various parts. These experiments were said to have been *undertaken as supplemental to those performed in England by Dr. Ferrier on cats and monkeys.* Full details given in *British Medical Journal*, of 22nd May, 1874.

Similar experiments to the last were performed on an Italian, Rinalducci, in the Hospital, at Turin, March 23rd, 1882, and of which an account was given by the operator, Dr. Egio Leamanna, in a paper on "Phenomena produced by the application of the electric current to the Dura Mater."

The *British Medical Journal*, July 3rd, 1897, gives an account of Dr. Sanarelli, of Monte Video, of his inoculations of human beings with the specific germs of yellow fever.

The *Boston Evening Transcript*, September 25th, 1897, contains a report of an interview with Professor Sanarelli, the yellow fever expert, who says: "My experiments on man reached the number of five. In two of the individuals I tried the effect of subcutaneous injections of the germ culture and in the other three that of intravenous injections. . . . The injection of the filtered culture in doses relatively small reproduces in man typical yellow fever. The fever, the congestion, the hæmorrhage, the vomit, the headache, the backache, the inflammation of the kidneys, the jaundice, the delirium, the final collapse—in short, all that conjunction of symptoms which constitutes the basis of the diagnosis of yellow fever—I have seen unrolled before my eyes, thanks to the potent influence of the yellow fever poison made in my laboratory."

In *Deutsche Medisinische Wochenschrift*, 1904, is an account of Dr. K. Menge, of University Hospital for Women, Leipsic, of his inoculation of three new born babies with morbid material.

In The *Bulletin* of the John Hopkins Hospital, for July, 1897, Henry J. Berkley, M.D., describes his experiments on eight insane persons. He says:—"It was directly for the purpose of ascertaining the toxicity (poisonous qualities) of one of the best known varieties of the thyroid extract that these experiments were undertaken."

The *Medical Record*, of New York, September 10th, 1892, contains an article by an American Surgeon giving details of the inoculation of little girls with syphilis.

The *Medical News*, of Philadelphia, April 1st, 1899, published an article referring to the "inoculation of cancer from man to man," done, "*both intentionally and successfully*" by an experimenter who "*is discreetly silent with regard to details.*"

DR. J. W. STICKLER, of Orange, New Jersey, presented a paper describing the inoculation by him (with the object of proving his theory that the virus of the one disease renders the patient immune to the other), of two children with "Foot and Mouth Disease," and subsequently exposing them to the infection of Scarlet Fever. He had been experimenting on these lines for years, for he says:—

"In the early part of the year, 1883, I inoculated twelve persons with virus obtained from horses. . . . *These twelve persons were also inoculated with human scarlatinal blood*, after they had been inoculated with equine virus. During the summer of the same year *I inoculated thirteen children*, all of whom had been, or were at the time of inoculation, exposed to the influence of air contaminated by the breath and exhalations of scarlatinal patients. . . . During the past year I have inoculated two children with the contents of

a vesicle produced on the abdomen of a calf by inoculation *with the virus of a patient who had had scarlet fever.*" (Italics mine.)

This paper was listened to by an audience including many of the leading physicians in New York, *but no word of censure was uttered on the ground of the immorality of such conduct.*

A full summary of these child-vivisections was published by The *Medical Record*, of New York, December 10th, 1887, and later by four of the principal medical journals in the U.S., also without *a word of Editoral criticism, protest, or remonstrance.*

Appendix V.

To those unacquainted with, or desirous of acquiring a knowledge of Vivisection, I would recommend a perusal of the undermentioned books:—

VIVISECTION, A VIEW FROM WITHIN, By Stephen Smith, M.R.C.S, 1/-; London A.V. Society, 13, Regent St., W.

A CATECHISM OF VIVISECTION (The whole subject argued in all its details), By E. Berdoe, L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S., 1/-; Swan, Sonnenschein & Co.

BROKEN GODS (a reply to Mr. Stephen Paget's "Experiments on Animals)," By Ed. Berdoe. L.R.C.P., &c, 1/-; Swan, Sonnenschein & Co.

FRUITLESS EXPERIMENT (An Examination and Critical Analysis of the Claims Advanced on behalf of Vivisection), Edited by Stephen Smith, M.R C.S., 1/- net; London A.V. Society.

And of smaller Publications:—

The Uselessness of Vivisection. By Lawson Tait, F.R.C.S., M.D., etc. 2d. post free.

Last Speech. By Lawson Tait, F.R.C.S., M.D., etc. 1d. post free.

Vivisection: Is it Morally Justifiable? By Dr. C. Bell Taylor. 1½d. post free.

Legal and Illegal Cruelty. By Edith Carrington.

All published by London A. V. Society, 13, Regent Street, W.

The Principal Claims on Behalf of Vivisection (A Refutation). By Dep. Surgeon-General Thornton, C.B. Published by National A. V. Association, Victoria Street, Westminster. 3d.

Beyond the Pale (an Appeal on behalf of the Victims of Vivisection). By Mona Caird. 3d. The Order of the Golden Age, Paignton.

A Sentimental View of Vivisection. By Mona Caird. 3d. ,, ,, ,, ,,

There are also a large number of Pamphlets and Leaflets dealing with various phases of the subject, published by the two A. V. Societies named above, and by the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, 14, St. James' Barton, Bristol.

PUBLICATIONS OF

THE ORDER OF THE GOLDEN AGE,

PAIGNTON, ENGLAND.

Official Journal:

"THE HERALD OF THE GOLDEN AGE."

A Journal published to advocate Humaneness, Purity in Diet, Obedience to Natural Law, and Spiritual Culture.

Quarterly. Illustrated. Threepence.

Circulation in thirty-eight Countries. To be obtained of all Newsagents. London Publishers, W. R. Russell & Co.. 5a, Paternoster Row.

"A Comprehensive Guide-Book to Natural, Hygienic and Humane Diet."

By Sidney H. Beard. *Twentieth Thousand. Price One Shilling. In Art Canvas, One Shilling and Sixpence.*

"Concerning Human Carnivorism."

By Rev. J. T. Ferrier. *Price One Shilling. In Art Linen, One Shilling and Sixpence.*

"Essays of the Golden Age."

By Josiah Oldfield, M.A., D.C.L., M.R.C.S. *Sixpence Net, post free.*

"Is Flesh-Eating Morally Defensible."

By Sidney H. Beard.

Seventh Edition. Thirty-fifth Thousand. Threepence, Post Free.

"The Penny Guide to Fruitarian Diet and Cookery."

By Dr. Josiah Oldfield.

One Shilling per Dozen. Seven Shillings and Sixpence per Hundred, post free.

"Why I Condemn Vivisection."

Robert H. Perks, M.D., F.R.C.S. *Price One Penny, 7/6 per hundred.*

PAMPHLETS.

Price One Penny. Five Shillings per Hundred, assorted if desired. Post free.

A Tale of Shame. Josiah Oldfield, M.A., D.C.L., M.R.C.S.

Dietetic Difficulties. Robert H. Perks, M.D., F.R.C.S.

The Overcoming of Pain and Death. Sidney H. Beard.

Humanity in Diet. Horace J. Snow.

What the Scientists Say Against Flesh-Eating. Fifth Edition. Sidney H. Beard.

The Coming Revolution in Diet. Fifth Edition. Sidney H. Beard.

A Cause of the Failure of Christian Missions in the East. Third Edition. Rev. W. D. Etherington, M.A.

Is Flesh-Eating a Violation of Apostolic Teaching? Third Edition. Rev. J. H, N. Nevill, M.A.

Facts Concerning Right Living. Second Edition. Dr. Josef Drzeweicki.

Christian Citizenship. Rev. W. J. Closs, B.A.

For List of Leaflets, &c, see the Official Journal.

All Persons who desire to promote Humaneness and Spiritual Attainment are invited to send for these Publications.

A COMPREHENSIVE

GUIDE-BOOK

To Natural, Hygienic and Humane Diet.

By SIDNEY H. BEARD.

Illustrated. Price **One Shilling Net.** In Art Canvas, **Eighteenpence Net.** Post Free.

Nearly twenty thousand copies of this book have already been issued from the Press in England and America. The sale steadily increases.

It is being freely purchased by doctors, teachers of physical culture, and leaders of thought in religious and food-reform circles in all parts of the world.

A very large number of favourable press opinions have been received.

Most persons who buy this book send for additional copies for their friends.

If you have not yet obtained a copy you would do well to secure one.

A FEW PRESS OPINIONS.

A Guide-Book that we heartily recommend to all who desire cleaner, more wholesome and simpler food. Many of our friends would fain abandon flesh meats, but know not the value of fruits, nuts and vegetables. The author comes to the assistance of the food reformer and renders good service thereby.—*New Age.*

The Introductory Chapters of this Guide-Book are quite enlightening. The bulk of the book however consists of practical recipes for a simple style of living, which is not only rational but pleasant and appetising—besides being humane. The whole deserves the attention of all who wish to make life worth living.—*Hereford Times.*

There is not a dull chapter in the whole book.—*Stirling Journal.*

The whole work is a valuable help in the correct understanding of the dieting of the human body. It is written with a freedom from 'faddism'—an evil that so often enters into and checks, in parasitical fashion, the growth of a new movement. There is shrewd common sense, a practical grasp of the subject, and a choice of only those arguments endorsed by scientific research.—*Torquay Times.*

N.B.—Friends in the United States who wish to obtain the book at the low price at which it is sold in England should write direct to Paignton for the English edition. Price twenty-five cents (canvas fifty cents) post free. Paper money, please. *No Coins.*

Concerning Human Carnivorism.

By Rev. J. TODD FERRIER.

Price **One Shilling Net.** In Art Linen, **Eighteenpence Net.**

This is one of the most powerful and interesting books that has ever been written to advocate Humanity and Purity in Diet. It will be recognised as a necessity in the library of every Food Reformer.

Its six chapters deal with The Records of History, The Testimony of Science, Some Economic Problems, Dynamic Value of Pure Food, A Plea for Humaneness, and The Voice of Religion.

A FEW PRESS OPINIONS.

These masterly essays . . . will convince any intelligent mind that justice and true religion require that flesh-eating and all the abominable tortures and horrors connected with the production of murdered food be abolished.—*Universal Republic*

Of the many works published on the subject of Vegetarianism, this is one of the best we have seen.—*Light of Reason.*

A beautfully printed handy book . . . is logical and scientific . . . Should appeal to the Conscience of all Truth Seekers. We hope the work will convince many.—*The Theosophic Gleaner.*

Certain to take rank as one of the classics of the Vegetarian movement. . . . The book appeals at almost all points to one's reason as well as to one's innate perception of morality.—*Macclesfield Courier.*

The little book is better than the title, if only because it grapples with Vivisection as well as flesh-eating; and in other ways it pleads for Humaneness as a flower that must grow along the royal road of Divine Love.—*Light.*

This is a scientific presentation of the case against flesh-eating. . . . It deals with the torture of animals for scientific purposes . , . very forcibly.—*Zoophilist.*

The Order of the Golden Age, Paignton, England.

Humanely disposed persons who desire to help in bringing about the abolition of Vivisection, are invited to obtain and circulate copies of this pamphlet amongst their friends and acquaintances—and thus to participate in the twentieth-century crusade against materialistic and scientific barbarism.

SOUTHWOOD & CO., EXETER.